



**Route 2 and 102 Stakeholder Visioning Process
Regular Meeting Notice**

**Stakeholder Group Meeting 1 Agenda
Thursday August 23, 2012
5:30 P.M.**

Beechwood Senior Center
44 Beach Street

**North Kingstown Town Hall
80 Boston Neck Road
North Kingstown, RI 02852
401-294-3331**

AGENDA

Stakeholder Group

Members

Michael Baker
Ahren Cohen
Mark Hawkins
Meg Kerr
Kevin Maloney
John Nosatch
Vaughn Oatley
Colin O'Sullivan
John Patterson
Richard Schartner, Sr.
Jeff Zucchi

Non-voting members

Frank DiGregorio
Paul Dion
Martha Pughe
Jonathan Reiner
David Schweid

5:30 Welcome and Introductions

- Review meeting agenda, goals, lead introductions – Ona Ferguson, CBI

5:45 Purpose of this Process

- Provide overview of purpose for this visioning effort – Jon Reiner, NK Planning

5:55 Process Overview

- Facilitator and stakeholder group discuss how the group will function, focusing on operating procedures and decision rule.

6:20 Key Issues for Future Discussion

- Stakeholders share their key hopes and generate list of topics to discuss during this process.

7:20 The Context: Overview of the Current Situation

- Presentation on key context for this project, including comprehensive planning, existing zoning, and other topics – Nate Kelly, Horsley Witten
- Discuss additional mapping or other information needed for next meeting.

8:00 Visioning Process Geographic Scope

- Discuss criteria for choosing the geographic boundaries.
- Discuss the proposed geographic scope of the study area & reach agreement.

8:15 Wrap Up / Stakeholder Group Business

- Participants discuss meeting dates, site visit, meeting venue, general feedback
- Clarify next steps – Ona Ferguson

8:25 Public Comment

8:30 Adjourn

**North Kingstown Route 2 and 102 Stakeholder Visioning Process
Meeting 1
August 23, 2012 5:30-8:45pm
Beechwood Senior Center, 44 Beach Street North Kingstown, RI**

Meeting Summary

Next Meeting: The next meeting is scheduled for September 6, 2012, from 6:00-9:00pm.

Meeting Participants: See Appendix A.

Next Steps:

- Project Team – Confirm member email addresses to be made public (by Sept 6)
- Project Team – Plan site visit (by Sept 6)
- Project Team – Revise Operating Procedures (by Sept 6)
- Project Team – Make maps to prepare for Meeting 2 discussion
- Project Team – Post link to Rhode Island Land Use 2025 Plan
- Members – Identify & let Project Team know if you will have an alternate (by Sept 6)

Welcome and Introductions

Ona Ferguson, facilitator from the Consensus Building Institute welcomed everyone to the meeting and gave an overview of the agenda. The goal of the meeting was to provide an opportunity for everyone to meet each other, to determine how the group was going to work together, to identify topics and issues that need to be addressed at future meetings, to review the current context, and to set a geographical boundary for the study area.

Stakeholder Group members introduced themselves, giving their affiliation and describing a quality they bring to the process. All materials from this meeting, including presentations, can be found within 10 days of the meeting at <http://www.northkingstown.org/visioning-process-routes-2-and-102>.

Purpose of this Visioning Process

Jon Reiner, the Director of the North Kingstown (NK) Planning Department and non-voting member of the Stakeholder Group, described the need for this group. The North Kingstown Town Council convened this group and allocated funds to support this process to generate a community vision for the western intersection of Routes 2 and 102. The NK Comprehensive Plan must be in compliance with the Rhode Island Land Use 2025 State Guide Plan Element and that requires that a plan and vision for this intersection be developed. The group is expected to meet regularly to explore interests, increase understanding, highlight and refine options and seek agreement, if possible, on what should happen in the area by the western Rt. 2/102 intersection. If this group reaches consensus or broad-based support for a recommendation, the Town Council and the Planning Commission will take that under serious consideration. Ona noted that there are a lot of strong opinions, feelings and interests at the table and in the community about what happens at this intersection, and that many have indicated hope in this group bringing some clarity of what to expect in the future that will benefit everyone.

Process Overview

Group Agreement Reached:

- Members will permit the team to share contact info (email and address) publicly.
- Members approved the Operating Procedures except for the Decision Rule (to be discussed further at Meeting 2), with changes as noted below re: alternates.

Members discussed how the Group will function (see more details in the draft Operating Procedures).

Overall Approach & Outcomes - Ona will be managing the process and facilitating meetings. The overall purpose of the process is to develop a shared concept for what should happen in the Rt. 2/102 area that most everyone can accept. The process for getting to that point will be to identify general issues, then discuss the varied interests and hopes and brainstorming ways to meet these interests, then to create a unified vision by combines these interests and brainstormed solutions into one comprehensive package or approach. There will be summaries of each Stakeholder Group meeting, focusing on agreements reached and the range of discussion points for various topics. The overall outcome/vision the group develops to will be synthesized in one report, including appropriate maps or technical language. The outcomes of the group depend on how the group works together and its ability to work through numerous topics to productive decisions. Possible outcomes range from no agreement to partial agreement to an overwhelming agreement.

Meeting Plan – The intent is to have three Stakeholder Group meetings (this one plus two in September), then two Public Workshops with a way to contribute online (which Stakeholder Group members will help design and attend), a focus group with residential neighbors, and then two to three more Stakeholder Group meetings after the Public Workshops.

Operating Procedures: Participants discussed and made some adjustments to the draft Operating Procedures. This list synthesizes key points and decisions made.

- Stakeholder Group meetings – Meetings will be open to the public. They will be summarized, and summaries will be posted on the project website. Members should strive to attend all meetings and scheduled events, and work to catch up after any meeting they miss.
- Alternates - Members discussed the role of alternates and decided there will be a minimum of one alternate for each of the two major stakeholder groups (rural/residential and business/development). Each group will choose their alternate. Alternates will be included in all member communication, will receive the introduction packet of materials, and are expected to attend all meetings to be fully up to speed should they need to sit at the table in place of a member.
- Communication - Members agree that email is the best form of communication for this process. They were asked to abide by the operating procedures / groundrules between meetings as well as at meetings, and to speak only for themselves, not for other people or for the Group as a whole.
- Decision Rule – Members discussed the threshold for reaching agreement in this process. They agreed that the goal is to seek overwhelming agreement across many perspectives so that any outcome is widely supported by the Stakeholder Group, while not setting the prohibitive threshold of unanimity. Participants did not reach final agreement on this topic, and it will be

taken up again at the next meeting. Participants discussed pros and cons of several decision thresholds, including

- Counts suggested
 - 7 out of 11 voting members agreeing indicates Group agreement
 - 8 out of 11 voting members agreeing indicates Group agreement (seven of nine voting members present at this meeting could live with this, the highest of the three options tested)
 - Capturing the final count for and against, whatever it may be (“taking the temperature of the group”) and reporting that number (possibly with language such as “majority favor, super majority, recommend, strongly recommend, overwhelming agreement, unanimity” tagged to different levels)
- With additional possible caveats to a strict numerical vote of:
 - At least one (or at least two) participant(s) from each of the two major groups must support it. This would mean any agreement would have to be acceptable to at least a portion of each of the two 4-person interest groups.
 - A minimum of 6 participants must agree (6 is a majority of 11 voting members)
- Discussions of options and criteria:
 - People don’t want the group to get stuck with too high a threshold for agreement. Some suggested aiming for between 60%-73% (75% requires 9)
 - People should have to convince others that an issue causing them to vote against something is important enough for others to vote with them to prevent agreement.
 - Abstention (step out of the vote if it isn’t a key interest for you) should count as dissenting and included in the count.
- Other discussion:
 - The final report will give the final count for and against an agreement and list the names of members who supported, abstained, or did not support the final agreement.
 - People decided that absent members not represented by an alternate may sign on to an agreement after the fact *but that this cannot change the outcome*. Given that everyone may have an alternate, the preference is for people to always have someone present to represent them.

Key Issues for Future Stakeholder Group Discussion

Members were asked to indicate what they hope to see as a result of this process and what topics the Group needs to work through. Their ideas are compiled and synthesized here.

Hopes for the Process

- That the residents get to weigh in on several options and get to voice their thoughts fairly
- That participants start with an open mind and clean slate
- That it respects the landowners
- That the interests of all participants are surfaced jointly
- That residents and business representatives work together productively
- That it becomes a model process for other sites in town
- That the excellent members and support team are creative and get to solutions

Issues / Topics the Group Wants to Work Through

- Community Goals - Goals that are shared by and distinct for NK and Exeter
- Interests of all participants – what do different people see as a vision for the area? Why do members hope for particular (and differing) levels of development?
- Water – quantity / how to protect water resources, quality
- Planning Tools - What innovative tools (ordinances, etc) can we use to advance joint goals?
- Development pressure – What is the reality and what does this mean (i.e. WJ station impacts)?
- Traffic Concerns
- Past History – full context and background
- Impacts on the full town, impacts to Exeter
- Development proposals – what is proposed and what might be acceptable / beneficial to residents?
- New ideas for designing intersections (see Grow Smart Rhode Island)
- Connectivity – Pedestrian and bike-friendly design, safety
- The Character of the area – how to add to it, how to leave a strong legacy in this place
- How to regulate growth to benefit everyone with clarified expectations, streamlined processes, appropriate protections
- Issues raised by Statewide Planning in denial of the NK Comprehensive Plan
- What is a growth center in this context?
- Transitional vision – how can the transitional space from big box to rural benefit residents and businesses? Look at north/south and east/west transitions
- Urban Services Boundary – how does it work, what does it mean?

Hopes for the Outcome

- It is acceptable for all the Stakeholder Group members
- It is sensitive and appropriate for NK & Exeter’s existing agricultural and rural character
- It considers impacts on all of NK and is beneficial to the town as a whole
- It makes sensible growth possible
- It adds to the character of the place, rather than detracting from it, it doesn’t have any significant negative impacts
- It describes development that neighbors find acceptable in scale and scope
- It protects water resources
- It enables for development while maintaining the character of the town
- It becomes a model for what future growth might look like in other parts of NK
- It is evidence based, numbers are used to support decisions as much as possible
- It will benefit many and meet the needs of many
- The NK Town Council respects any consensus / package proposal developed by the Stakeholder Group and understands that support for one piece may be contingent on another piece.
- It fits with current regulations and state guidelines
- It does not harm the natural environment, it is environmentally sound
- It does not include sprawl
- It is economically viable for landowners
- It streamlines the process for businesses to get approval, reducing the need for problem solving through litigation
- It gets incorporated into the current Comprehensive Plan and the 2013 Plan re-write

The Context: Overview of the Current Situation

Nate Kelley, from Horsley Witten Group, described the current context of the area. He explained the planning regulation at the State level and local level. He explained the role that Statewide Planning, Rhode Island Department of Transportation, Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management, and Rhode Island Housing play at the State level. On the local level, he described the role Department of Planning, the North Kingstown Planning Commission, the Water Department, the Town Council, other boards and commissions play in the process. He described the current regulations on the area. He explained the tools and options available to developers, such as the TDR sending and receiving areas and the compact village development ordinance. Statewide Planning has both recently rejected a petition for an up-zoning of the Rit Schartner parcel and requested a vision be developed for the area. Nate's presentation, available on the website, has more detail and is designed to be read with links to key information.

Visioning Process Geographic Scope

At the request of Peter Flinker, of Dodson and Associates (part of the project's technical team), members discussed what the core geographic area for the visioning process should be and also what broader area that will be impacted should be considered. People talked about the parcels right at the intersection with an interest in commercial use, the role of and connection to Exeter, existing conditions and the market. They then suggested several different ways to consider the two areas, as follows. People have not yet reached agreement on this, and this list captures the various suggestions people had, some of which are contradictory. The project team will come to the next meeting with maps responding to these ideas and proposing geographic scope for the group to make a final decision on.

Suggestions for The Study Area/Core Area to Consider for Change (to seek agreement on in this process)

- The parcels that are currently zoned commercial at the intersection including the Corner Tavern, the Bald Hill Garden Center, Oatley's restaurant, and the Schartner Bald Hill Nursery.
- The parcels that are currently zoned commercial at the intersection including the Corner Tavern, the Bald Hill Garden Center, Oatley's restaurant, the Schartner Bald Hill Nursery, and to include the Rolling Greens application area.
- Focus on the areas the Town Council most wants the group's input on.
- All parcels abutting the intersection until you hit residential parcels
- A half-mile radius from the intersection in all directions: either including Exeter or stopping at the NK/Exeter boundary, in a circle or in a square
- Include Morris Farm (200' in NK, rest in Exeter)
- The road all the way to Rt. 4
- Residential areas also / no residential area

Suggestions for the Area Likely to be Impacted By A Vision (to be aware of in this process)

- A half-mile radius from the intersection in each direction
- All of North Kingstown including: the abutting residential areas, the area to Rt 4, Post Road, TDR sending areas
- Exeter, including its proposed village areas

Other

Participants discussed the desire by the members from Exeter that the Stakeholder Group fully consider the impact of this decision and possibly make decisions that stretch into Exeter. Exeter members indicated that Exeter has a strong preference to maintain a rural character. While the intersection has an impact on Exeter, several people said this process is designed to address an area within the NK border and to include Exeter's interests (as desired by Statewide Planning and by others) by providing several seats at the table while keeping the decision making to North Kingstown representatives. NK does not have authority over Exeter's land use patterns, and cannot make Exeter change their zoning or land use designations.

Members representing the rural/residential perspective expressed serious concern about a perceived conflict of interests about past actions of one of the four members of their interest group, as designated by the Town Council. The facilitator said that the Town Council's decision on Stakeholder Group membership is final and cannot be changed at this time.

Public Comment

Members of the public were invited to share their thoughts. Jim Ganung, resident of Wickford Highlands, asked the group to use as much data and information as possible as part of the visioning process. Matt Richardson, resident, said that what ever happens in North Kingstown will impact Exeter, that what happens at the intersection could draw visitors or drive them away, and that agriculture is an important business interest. Jim Grundy, a Planning Commission member, reminded the participants that they are an advisory, not decision-making, group and said he hopes they will be independent thinkers.

Stakeholder Group Business

The group discussed meeting times, and 6:00 to 9:00 works best. The next two Stakeholder Group meetings are scheduled for Thursday, September 6th and Monday the September 24. There will be a site visit or two between now and the September 6 meeting. The meeting adjourned at 8:47pm.

APPENDIX A: Meeting Participants

Stakeholder Group Members & Alternates Present

Alternates are noted with an asterix

Michael Baker
Ahren Cohen
Frank Digregorio
Paul Dion
Mark Hawkins
Meg Kerr
Kevin Maloney
John Nosatch
Vaughn Oatley
Colin O’Sullivan
Jonathan Reiner
Richard Schartner, Sr.
David Schweid
Jeff Zucchi

(Members absent:

John Patterson, Martha Pughe)

Project Team & NK Planning Dept. Staff

Nicole Bourassa
Ona Ferguson
Peter Flinker
Nate Kelly
Becky Lamond
Jonathan Reiner
Jared Weaver

Also In Attendance

Jerry Duffy
Jim Ganung
Kevin Harris
Mr. Edward Mancini
Mrs. Edward Mancini
Curt Matteson
Chip Palmer
Skip Ponte
David Samson
Marilyn Shellman
Rick Thompson



**North Kingstown Route 2 and 102 Stakeholder Visioning Process
Regular Meeting Notice**

**Stakeholder Group Meeting 2 Agenda
Thursday September 6, 2012
6:00 P.M.**

Beechwood Senior Center
44 Beach Street

**North Kingstown Town Hall
80 Boston Neck Road
North Kingstown, RI 02852
401-294-3331**

AGENDA

Stakeholder Group

Members

Michael Baker
Ahren Cohen
Mark Hawkins
Meg Kerr
Kevin Maloney
John Nosatch
Vaughn Oatley
Colin O'Sullivan
John Patterson
Richard Schartner, Sr.
Jeff Zucchi

Alternates

Tom Kolling

Non-voting members

Frank DiGregorio
Paul Dion
Martha Pugh
Jonathan Reiner
David Schweid

6:00 Welcome and Introductions

- Review meeting agenda & goals, lead introductions – Ona Ferguson, CBI

6:10 Finalize Operating Procedures and Geographic Scope

- Discuss and decide on decision rule, operating procedures, geographic scope

6:30 Site Constraints and Physical Suitability

- Review maps of site constraints – Peter Flinker, Dodson Associates
- Discuss suitability, any additional information needed

7:15 Current Buildout Capacity

- Presentation of current site buildout capacity – Peter Flinker
- Discuss buildout capacity

7:50 Interests on Key Topics

- Discuss key interests related to topics such as water, character, community goals

8:20 What Would We Like to See in this Area?

- Discuss the opportunities for this area overall

8:45 Public Comment

8:55 Wrap Up / Stakeholder Group Business

- Participants discuss meeting dates, general business
- Clarify next steps

9:00 Adjourn

Documentation (if any) for items listed on this Agenda is available for public inspection, a minimum of 24 hours prior to the Board meeting, at any time during regular business hours at the Department of Planning, 55 Brown Street, North Kingstown, RI 02852. The Town of North Kingstown will provide interpreters for the hearing impaired given three days notice in advance. 294-3331, Ext 120. Pursuant to RIGL 42-46-6(c) notice of this meeting has been posted on the Secretary of State's website.

Route 2 and 102 Stakeholder Visioning Process
Meeting 2
September 6, 2012 6:00-9:00 pm
Beechwood Senior Center, 44 Beach Street North Kingstown, RI

Meeting Summary

Next Meeting: The next meeting will be in late September (date to be determined) from 6:00-9:00pm at Wickford Middle School.

Meeting Participants: See Appendix A.

Next Steps:

- Jon Reiner – Let people know when the RIDOT roundabout meeting is scheduled
- Peter Flinker – Develop renderings of some different approaches for future visions
- Project Team – Create a map showing the final study area
- Members – Tell Ona about any alternates by 9/14
- Members – Review the Compact Village District Ordinance (on the project website and in your initial packet of materials)
- Landowners in the study area (and other members if you have them) – Send Jon your proposals and designs for your site & the area

Welcome and Introductions

Ona Ferguson, facilitator from the Consensus Building Institute facilitation team welcomed everyone to the meeting and led Stakeholder Group (SHG) introductions. Jeff Zucchi's alternate, Tom Kolling, sat in for Jeff. All materials from this meeting, including presentations, can be found within 10 days of the meeting at <http://www.northkingstown.org/visioning-process-routes-2-and-102>. The SHG approved the draft summary of SHG Meeting 1 with a few typo corrections and the addition of a point about membership in the summary section "Other."

Finalize Operating Procedures, Decision Rule & Geographic Scope

Group Agreement Reached:

- Members approved the Operating Procedures, including Decision Rule.
- Members decided on the geographic study area and area of influence.
- Members generally agreed that the residential area between the study area and Rt 4 should remain residential.

Members approved Operating Procedures as revised by the facilitator after the first meeting, with a few changes:

- Voting members who are absent may designate a SHG colleague to represent them.
- Interest groups are not required to have an alternate.
- All alternates are required to make all meetings and stay up to date on SHG discussions.

Members agreed that the threshold for broad agreement in regards to the decision rule will be 8 out of 11 with at least 2 votes of support each from the business/development and rural/residential groups.

The final report will record where broad agreement was met and where it was not and why. This threshold of agreement will indicate clearly to the Town Council those topics that were widely agreed upon.

Members also finalized the geographic scope of the study area, building on the discussion at meeting 1. They discussed multiple options for what should be inside the study area or inside the area of influence. Jon Reiner tested with the group several times possible agreement of everyone that the area between the study area and Rt 4 along the road should remain residential going forward. No one disagreed. The formal study area will be the parcels currently zoned commercial at the intersection including the Corner Tavern, the Bald Hill Garden Center, Oatley's restaurant, the Schartner Bald Hill Nursery, plus the Rolling Greens application area. The area of influence members want to be sure to also pay attention to includes a half mile radius from the intersection, encompassing all adjacent parcels, extending to include all the parcels along route 102 to route 4. Members will continue to consider broader areas likely to be impacted by what happens at this intersection as well. People briefly discussed that land conserved with deed restriction is fairly permanently protected from development, whereas land that is not zoned commercial could in the future have that zoning changed to allow commercial development. Jon noted that having language in the comprehensive plan from this group indicating what you want to see will likely shape development for the next couple decades, which is the planning horizon of the comprehensive plan.

Physical Suitability and Site Constraints

Peter Flinker, Project Team member from Dodson and Associates, presented the physical limitations of the site and adjacent area. He showed maps of the study area without delineations of property boundaries, considering it all as a unified area. He depicted wetlands, streams, and soils, and briefly discussed that wetlands are protected by state law. These different maps all indicated moisture in the same general places, and Peter noted that it can be difficult to develop in areas with high water tables and especially moist soils. Members observed that there are almost no physical constraints on the study area itself, and noted that there are wetlands and streams in the surrounding areas. A member asked if water is a limiting site constraint, and Peter said that water will be discussed at a future meeting. A member of the public pointed out an area of wetlands, and Peter noted that general maps such as the ones he was showing get made more accurate and specific by surveyors and in development plans.

Current Buildout Capacity

Peter presented maps showing what the study area could look like if built out 100% under current zoning regulations. The maps showed commercial offices, pharmacies, banks and residential developments, with required parking spaces. Peter noted that in reality, if landowners sought to build at this scale, what was shown would likely be a bit more limited due to the planning process and other regulations, but that the character of the development would remain. He described buildout like this as a legal tool to show what could be constructed legally and physically (in terms of scale and type of use) according to today's rules. Members didn't discuss these images much, as they noted that such buildout is unlikely at this time.

Key Interests a Vision Should Strive to Meet

In order to identify the interests (key hopes/desires/needs) that the final vision should meet, Ona presented the group with a list of interests she had heard articulated by participants about this area over time. Members added to the list of interests to make it complete. The following list is the group's full list of (sometimes contradictory) interests that they hope the final vision will achieve, grouped by category:

Character

- Rural/suburban
- Effective transition zone from commercial (Rt. 4) to rural (Exeter)
- Experience as calm, peaceful, nice neighborhood
- Recreational areas to build sense of community
- Small-scale, appropriate commercial, including agricultural businesses
- Appropriate type of development for neighborhood
- Thoughtful village/ more dense (vs. sprawl or strip-mall) commercial
- Good architecture design
- Contained commercial area (not filling in from Rt. 4 to intersection)
- Mixed use (some small commercial, some homes, some agricultural)
- Enhance sense of community for existing residential neighborhoods

Economics / \$ / Taxes

- Positive or neutral impact on taxes
 - Limit added school demand
 - Limit added costs of providing infrastructure (water, sewer, fire, roads)
- Supportive of other Town- or Region-wide investments, not detracting from them
- Economic viability for land owners
- Positive or neutral impact on residential land and property values
- Viable businesses, not empty storefronts
- Good design to improve value of development

Water

- Adequate supply and storage (quantity) for today and the future
 - Human use, including adequate volume and pressure for fire emergency
 - Ecosystem well-being
 - No undue impact on water supply for NK Town-wide
- High quality – provide effective wastewater management/treatment, prevent damage from nitrate loading
- Protect the watershed and aquifer
- Appropriate management of flooding and stormwater
- Appropriate municipal capacity to provide water and water flow

Traffic / Transportation

- Not too congested, able to get onto and off side roads, traffic calming

- Safe movement of people & vehicles
- Bike connector routes, bike friendly
- Pedestrian connector routes, pedestrian friendly
- Appropriate traffic management between here and Rt 4 (and further)
- Move high volume of traffic through area safely
- Reduction of through traffic
- Coordination with RI DOT, State, MBTA transportation initiatives
- Address summer traffic

Other

- Other environmental issues
 - Protective of sensitive resources like slopes, wetlands
 - Protect some open space, build upon protected open space
- Broad community issues and goals
 - Positive or neutral impact on
 - Other areas in North Kingstown, including Post Road
 - Exeter
 - Supports community goals of (e.g. the bond to protect open space)
 - North Kingstown
 - Exeter
- Approvable by Statewide Planning
- Makes sensible growth possible, fair decision process
- Evidence-based, uses numbers when possible
- Provide public recreational opportunities, e.g. Golf course

While discussing the list of interests, members shared some related thoughts. Someone noted the importance of exploring the relationship between the newly opened Wickford Junction train station and the study area. Someone noted that it is possible to safely moving traffic through the intersection while doing traffic calming, and someone highlighted the challenge of slowing traffic while trying to move vehicles through efficiently. People mentioned that traffic in the summertime is exceedingly heavy in the study area because of people going to the beach.

Suggestions for What to Develop for Meeting 3

Members brainstormed ideas for visual aides they would like to see for the study area at the next SHG meeting. The Project Team was asked to find or create, ideally showing some street-view images:

- Case studies, photographs and and examples of efforts to guide growth as intended from this region (e.g. South County Commons mixed use development) and from elsewhere.
- Renderings or images of
 - Destination type development, with small businesses and a character appropriate to the study area, with recreational opportunities and pedestrian connectors.
 - Small-scale commercial development with management of through traffic.
 - The proposals by and ideas of the current property owners for their sites.
 - A way to visualize the area as a gateway to Exeter and as a gateway to South County.
 - Likely development patterns or approaches (not theoretical ones that are unlikely here).

- Transfer of development rights (TDR) to preserve Exeter land, e.g. Morris Farm.
- Images that help the group look at site-based decisions in context, and not individually
- Fiscal impacts of the current buildout scenario: school impacts, infrastructure and taxes.
- Program elements to consider: Small scale agricultural commercial uses appropriate to this area (e.g. farmers markets), Residential, Recreational, Open space, Traffic management / roadways.

Public Comment

The facilitator reminded the public that they are welcome to contact those on the SHG who represent them or their interests, noting that the SHG contact list is now public. Chet Matteson, owner of the Corner Tavern, indicated that he understands the need to create places that are pleasing to the eye, said he wants to manage a great restaurant, and asked that his parcel not be down zoned to residential, but kept as general business.

Other

The RIDOT public meeting is scheduled on October 1st either at 6 or 7pm. It will discuss the DOT's intention for a round a bout at the study area intersection.

Stakeholder Group Business

Upcoming Events – The next SHG meeting, scheduled for September 24, conflicts with a Town Council Meeting. Ona will test different dates that week and select the date that works the best for everyone. She will also start to work on scheduling the public workshops. Ona will start working with resident representatives soon to plan the resident focus group.

Research Project - Ona said that MIT graduate student Rob Goodspeed is interested in conducting research during the public workshops about how visual tools help the community visioning process. He will present his proposal at the next SHG meeting, for members to decide whether it is workable.

The meeting adjourned at 8:43 pm.

APPENDIX A: Meeting Participants

Stakeholder Group Member & Alternates Present

Alternates are noted with an asterix

Michael Baker
Ahren Cohen
Frank Digregorio
Paul Dion
Mark Hawkins
Thomas Kolling* (for Jeff Zucchi)
Kevin Maloney
John Nosatch
Vaughn Oatley
Colin O’Sullivan
Martha Pugh
John A. Patterson
Jonathan Reiner
Rit Schartner
David Schweid

Members absent

Meg Kerr
Jeff Zucchi

Project Team & NK Planning Dept. Staff

Ona Ferguson
Peter Flinker
Becky Lamond
Jared Weaver

Also in Attendance (this list is incomplete)

Jerry Duffy
Jim Ganung
Sue Licardi
Albert Lyons
Ron Mann
Chet Matteson
Alice O’Sullivan
Jack Revans
David Samson
Marie Samson
Rich Schartner (Jr)
Skip [Last Name?]



**North Kingstown Route 2 and 102 Stakeholder Visioning Process
Regular Meeting Notice**

**Stakeholder Group Meeting 3 Agenda
Wednesday September 26, 2012
6:00 P.M.**

Wickford Middle School Cafeteria
250 Tower Hill Road, North Kingstown, RI

**North Kingstown Town Hall
80 Boston Neck Road
North Kingstown, RI 02852
401-294-3331**

AGENDA

Stakeholder Group

Members

Michael Baker
Ahren Cohen
Mark Hawkins
Meg Kerr
Kevin Maloney
John Nosatch
Vaughn Oatley
Colin O'Sullivan
John Patterson
Richard Schartner, Sr.
Jeff Zucchi

Non-voting Members

Frank DiGregorio
Paul Dion
Martha Pugh
Jonathan Reiner
David Schweid

Alternates

Michael Abbott
Tom Kolling
Albert Lyons
Richard Schartner II

6:00 Welcome and Introductions

- Review agenda, introductions, approve Meeting 2 notes – Ona Ferguson, CBI

6:15 Possible Impacts: Water and Economics

- Presentation and discussion about possible impacts raised in previous meetings – Nate Kelly, Horsley Witten

7:15 Discussion of Several Study Area Visions

- Discussion about some possible visions for the study area and examples from other places, based on participant interests – Peter Flinker, Dodson Associates

8:30 Public Workshop Structure

- Discussion about proposed approach to the public workshops – Ona Ferguson

8:45 Public Comment

8:55 Wrap Up / Stakeholder Group Business

- Review of meeting dates, general business
- Clarify next steps

9:00 Adjourn

Documentation (if any) for items listed on this Agenda is available for public inspection, a minimum of 24 hours prior to the Board meeting, at any time during regular business hours at the Department of Planning, 55 Brown Street, North Kingstown, RI 02852. The Town of North Kingstown will provide interpreters for the hearing impaired given three days notice in advance. 294-3331, Ext 120. Pursuant to RIGL 42-46-6(c) notice of this meeting has been posted on the Secretary of State's website.

Route 2 and 102 Stakeholder Visioning Process
Meeting 3
September 26, 2012 6:00-9:00 pm
Wickford Middle School, North Kingstown, RI

Meeting Summary

Next Meetings: The next meeting, a Public Workshop, is scheduled for October 4, 6:00-9:00pm at Wickford Middle School. Subsequently, there is a Neighborhood Focus Group scheduled for October 10th, location to be determined. The next meeting of the Stakeholder Group will be Thursday October 25th, from 6-9pm, location TBD.

Meeting Participants: See Appendix A.

Next Steps:

- Project Team – develop Public Workshop agenda & refine scenarios to present.
- Project Team – develop online input approach.
- Project Team – review economic impact questions raised during the meeting.

Welcome and Introductions

Stakeholder Group members introduced themselves. All meeting materials can be found on the North Kingstown website, <http://www.northkingstown.org/visioning-process-routes-2-and-102>. The Stakeholder Group approved the Meeting 2 summary.

Ona Ferguson, facilitator, noted that several Stakeholder Group members had expressed concern about the timeline of the Planning Commission, which is scheduled to review the Rolling Greens Master Plan Amendment request in parallel to this visioning process. She reported that Liz Dolan, Chair of the Town Council, told her that the Planning Commission is required to review the submission per state law within certain time frames, but that the Town Council is not planning to make any decisions about what happens in the study area until after it has had time to review the final recommendations of the stakeholder group. Liz will discuss this process with the rest of the Town Council members at their October 1 meeting.

Possible Impacts: Water and Economics

In response to requests at the second Stakeholder Group meeting for more information on water and economics related to any development of the study area, Nate Kelly of Horsley Witten presented some additional background on these two subjects. His detailed presentation can be found on the project website.

Water

Nate described the North Kingstown system for water collection as storage and distribution. North Kingstown has a groundwater collection system (as opposed to a surface water system) with 11 different water wells and 5 water storage tanks that provide water for those on the town system. The distribution system runs throughout most of the Town. However, the Water Service Area is more limited in geographic scope. This more limited area shows where new connections for larger development are potentially allowable.

Nate noted that there is generally adequate water through the year, and that the challenge comes in summer, when demand is at its highest as people water lawns and groundwater supply is at its lowest. He described some of the water modeling scenarios used by North Kingstown to gauge the impact of new development on current water infrastructure. These models consistently show problems in long term demand, particularly in the summer peak demand season. The study area lies within the Annaquatucket aquifer.

North Kingstown addresses water quality and quantity through regulation in three broad categories: through land use planning designation, regulation of construction practices, and regulation of post-construction water use behaviors. On the land use planning side, North Kingstown uses tools like the transfer of development rights, which preserves land for recharging the aquifers, to actively protect water quantity. It incentivizes the use of compact village development, which uses less water per person per acre than traditional development patterns. It was noted that the town is currently discussing downsizing its current Water Service Area in an attempt to focus new water system connections to areas designated for growth in the Comprehensive Plan.

With regard to construction activity, North Kingstown requires best practices during construction such as selecting and maintaining plantings through a comprehensive landscaping ordinances to minimize water usage. Erosion and sediment controls as well as the State Stormwater Manual guide site designs and are focused on encouraging water capture, storage, and recharge on site. Once a site has been developed and buildings are occupied, the town monitors water use and gives financial incentives to encourage people to minimize water use. The water billing structure works in “blocks” and the higher the usage, the higher the rate applied for each gallon of use.

On the issue of water quality, Nate gave information about nitrate loading limitations, which are used to protect water quality in North Kingstown. Groundwater can easily be tested for nitrates and modeled, and North Kingstown uses models prior to development to ensure that the planned construction and end use will result in a permissible amount of nitrate loading. Nitrogen comes from many different sources on a given site including wastewater discharge, fertilizer application and stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces. Wastewater is almost always the highest contributor. North Kingstown requires all non-residential or mixed use development within the Groundwater Overlay districts to demonstrate that the amount of nitrogen produced by the development will not create a concentration in groundwater below the site higher than 5 mg/L. This standard is half the EPA threshold for safe drinking water (10 mg/L) and is used by many jurisdictions around the country as a conservative approach.

Stakeholder Group members had a range of questions, among which key themes are highlighted here, with answers in italics from the Project Team:

- Does this study area have aquifer problems? *The aquifer is stressed now in the summer months. When water supply is low in the summer, high human water use from lawn watering and other outdoor use can impact wetlands and streams (which dry up and become more shallow). In extreme conditions, the aquifer cannot yield enough water for the system.*
- What is the difference between water usage among uses (commercial, residential, industrial, etc.)? *Single family residential uses the most water. Agricultural users tend to use their own wells or cisterns for water storage, so they have a relatively low impact on the water system. Quonset Industrial Park requires that new users and older users where possible use its non-potable groundwater for watering landscaping.*

- Why is North Kingstown thinking of decreasing the water service area? What benefits will that provide, or what impact will it have on the public water system? *The town infrastructure, the actual town wells that pump the water, do not have the capacity to supply water to all of the current areas inside the current Water Service Area at current water use amounts. The state will not let us put in more municipal wells. Limiting the Water Service Area will limit the ability for new development outside of the WSA to connect to the system, providing a disincentive to develop outside the WSA. Where developers still choose to do so, they will be required to drill their own well on-site. This will still impact the aquifer. But because the withdrawal and the recharge are on the same site, that impact is minimized. A rule of thumb number for this situation is a 15% loss of water overall.*
- Do agricultural uses draw from the same aquifer with their wells? *Yes, but because they draw water locally and because much of it goes back into the ground onsite, the impact on the aquifer is far less than that of the town system.*

Mark Hawkins handed out a document with some water and nitrate loading calculations on it for Stakeholder Group members to read.

Economics

Nate Kelly described some possible fiscal impacts related to development of the study area. One issue he and the Project Team considered is that of school children, who contribute the largest piece to the town's budget. While dividing the school budget by the number of students generates a cost of almost \$11,000 per child per year, the question of cost per student is more complex than that calculation implies. Right now North Kingstown has the capacity for more school children in the town's school system. The infrastructure needed for school children is already in place. So the incremental cost of adding a child to the system might be more like half of that number for the time being. The project team would need to spend a substantial amount of additional time on this issue, and will contribute some time in the future to attempt to clarify this information. A Stakeholder Group member said that despite the fact that North Kingstown has capacity, additional school children at this intersection will have a fiscal impact, and the goal should not be to get to capacity, but to consider impacts.

Stakeholder group members noted that Post Road is struggling economically and expressed concern that development here might harm development in other parts of town. Several people also noted that market demands have a significant role in what does or does not get developed, and that isn't something this group can determine. A few Stakeholder group members asked for more precise numbers on schools and other aspects of development. Nate and Jon Reiner said that the type of economic analysis required to quantify the impacts to Post Road from a CVD development in the study area is an enormous undertaking and could not be performed as part of this process. Jon and Nate said they would look into whether there may be other meaningful ways to get at the answer.

Study Area Scenarios for Discussion

Peter Flinker, Dodson & Flinker, presented several scenarios for possible futures of the study area. Since there are relatively few physical constraints on development in the study area, he identified the nitrate loading required as part of local regulations as the primary limiting factor on development. These scenarios were developed to provide the Stakeholder Group something somewhat precise to react to. They were also intended as straw man scenarios to possibly use at the upcoming Public Workshops and Neighborhood Focus Group. The goal eventually is for Stakeholder Group members to talk through benefits and problems with various scenarios until they jointly develop something that they can all live

with. At this meeting, members didn't have much time to give feedback, but their input shaped the scenarios presented at the Public Workshop and Neighborhood Focus Group.

Right of Way

Regardless of the future vision for the study area, there is a 165-foot right of way that belongs to the RI Department of Transportation (RIDOT) running east/west along Rt 102. This is an area that the Stakeholder Group cannot design, yet Jon Reiner said that he thought RIDOT would be open to presenting information to the group, or to hearing suggestions or input on what people would like to see in this wide area along the road. The design of the right of way could help tie the final plan for the study area together. Peter shared some drawings and ideas for the right of way, suggesting opportunities including:

- Establishing a safe and attractive walking and biking connection connecting existing neighborhoods to each other and to adjacent commercial areas.
- Preserving as many of the existing trees and other vegetation as possible to maintain the landscape character of the roadside and buffer surrounding neighborhoods from the view and sounds of the road.
- Creating a multi-purpose path along both sides of the road to allow walking and biking from Rt. 4 to Route 2, and continuing south and west to Exeter.
- Integrating paths and landscape improvements within the right of way with plans for Rolling Greens and other projects, so that a consistent level of quality and character can be maintained throughout the area.

Scenario 1: Current Buildout

This scenario begins with the amount of development that is allowed under current zoning and reduces the total based on the constraints of the 5 mg/l limit on nitrate loading. The residentially-zoned Rolling Greens parcel would thus be restricted to 54 residential units; the Shartner parcel could support approximately 60,000 s.f. of commercial/office space on a 20,000 s.f. footprint; and the Bald Hill Garden Center could support about 67,000 s.f. of commercial use. While a somewhat larger building could be built on the Corner Tavern site, it is likely that the existing restaurant – which would be impossible to build under current nitrate limitations -- would remain as grandfathered use. Peter noted that nitrate regulations in Exeter might allow for greater commercial density on the Exeter Shartner parcel. Finally, the Morris Farm, which is subject to four-acre zoning in Exeter, could be built out for about 17 house lots, including four existing homes.

Scenario 2: Conservation Development

This scenario depicts a conservation development approach. Business would continue in the same lots as it has previously, and all other development would be residential on half-acre lots following the town's existing Conservation Development ordinance. The emphasis of this approach is to protect the most important open space, including the golf course, the Morris Farm, and farm land south of the intersection – and accommodate residential development in areas that are largely hidden from routes 2 and 102. There would be little commercial other than what is already present.

Stakeholder Group members gave feedback including that this is the one that some people think fits best in the study area as it currently is, and that this is the scenario some of the neighbors have been looking for. Others noted that many of the businesses in the study area would likely object to the down-zoning of their properties from general business to residential.

Scenario 3: Village Development

This scenario shows a mix of commercial and residential development as would be allowed under the CVD ordinance. It thus includes the current plan for Rolling Greens, with 50,000 s.f. of commercial facing Rt. 102, and residential streets stretching out to the north. On the south side of 102, the plan takes the amount of commercial predicted by the buidout and rearranges it on the site to create the kind of walkable village character envisioned by the ordinance. Buildings are lined up along an internal street network, with some parking on the street and more placed in the rear of buildings. Continuous sidewalks, trees, benches, etc. would encourage people to park their cars once and walk from one building to another within the village. On the Shartner properties, in particular, uses could include a farmer's market, food processing, and other elements that could take advantage of the nearby farmland.

Stakeholder Group members asked whether this amount of commercial development would draw people away from the shops at Wickford Junction. Some said this seemed like a lot of commercial.

Generally, Stakeholder Group members commented in response to all of these scenarios that whatever the group recommends should be a net gain for the town and should give the place character as the gateway to South County and Exeter. The solution from this group needs to be something that works best for the town and for the people, not just for one group.

Upcoming Public Workshops

Participants reviewed a proposed approach to the structure of two upcoming Public Workshops, a Neighborhood Focus Group and a way to give input online. These will be structured to allow the public to share thoughts about the study area, and feedback from these different public engagement approaches will be compiled and provided for consideration by Stakeholder Group members. Stakeholder group members recommended that presenters be very clear what can and cannot be accomplished, and that the Project Team let the public have lots of time to give their input. They also acknowledged the difficulty of explaining all the relevant information to a public with a range of interest, background knowledge and capacity.

Ona said she would send around a request from Rob Goodspeed, a doctoral student at MIT, to survey pre and post meeting at one of the public workshops. [Update: she did not end up doing this due to scheduling/coordination challenges.]

Public Comment

John Revens stated that site owners today may not have plans for future development because development occurs based on market drivers of what is allowed and whether there is a willing buyer/customer with specific ideas and intentions.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 pm.

APPENDIX A: Meeting Participants

Stakeholder Group Member & Alternates Present

Alternates are noted with an asterix

Michael Abbot* (For Frank Digregorio)

Michael Baker

Ahren Cohen

Paul Dion

Mark Hawkins

Meg Kerr

Tom Kolling* (For Jeff Zucchi)

Kevin Maloney

John Nosatch

Vaughn Oatley

Colin O'Sullivan

John Patterson

Martha Pugh

Jon Reiner

Rit Schartner

David Schweid

Absent Members

Frank DiGregorio

Jeff Zucchi

Project Team & NK Planning Dept. Staff

Ona Ferguson

Peter Flinker

Nate Kelley

Becky Lamond

Jared Weaver

Also in Attendance

Jerry Duffy

Tim Cranston

Donna Hutchinson

Lori Kay

Ron Mann

Alice O'Sullivan

Skip Ponte

John Revens

David Sampson

Marin Sampson

Rich Schartner

Rick Thompson



North Kingstown Route 2 and 102 Stakeholder Visioning Process Regular Meeting Notice

Stakeholder Group Meeting 4 Agenda Thursday October 25, 2012 6:00 P.M.

Wickford Middle School Cafeteria
250 Tower Hill Road, North Kingstown, RI

North Kingstown Town Hall
80 Boston Neck Road
North Kingstown, RI 02852
401-294-3331

AGENDA

Stakeholder Group

Members

Michael Baker
Ahren Cohen
Mark Hawkins
Meg Kerr
Kevin Maloney
John Nosatch
Vaughn Oatley
Colin O'Sullivan
John Patterson
Richard Schartner, Sr.
Jeff Zucchi

Non-voting Members

Frank DiGregorio
Paul Dion
Martha Pugh
Jonathan Reiner
David Schweid

Alternates

Michael Abbott
Tom Kolling
Albert Lyons
Richard Schartner II

6:00 Welcome and Introductions

- Review agenda, introductions, approve Meeting 3 notes – Ona Ferguson, CBI

6:10 Discussion of 5 Development Scenarios

- Brief overview of the 5 development options presented at the workshop meetings – Peter Flinker, Dodson and Flinker
- Input received online, at 2 Public Workshops and at Neighborhood Focus Group – Ona Ferguson

6:30 Questions from Stakeholder Group on topics discussed to date

7:00 Discussion of Development Options

- 5 Development Scenarios
- Roadway Right of Way Improvements
- Comprehensive Plan Recommendations
 - Land Use Designations
 - Urban Services Boundary and Growth Centers
 - Water Service Area

8:45 Public Comment

8:55 Wrap Up / Stakeholder Group Business

- Review of meeting dates, general business
- Clarify next steps

9:00 Adjourn

Documentation (if any) for items listed on this Agenda is available for public inspection, a minimum of 24 hours prior to the Board meeting, at any time during regular business hours at the Department of Planning, 55 Brown Street, North Kingstown, RI 02852. The Town of North Kingstown will provide interpreters for the hearing impaired given three days notice in advance. 294-3331, Ext 120. Pursuant to RIGL 42-46-6(c) notice of this meeting has been posted on the Secretary of State's website.

Route 2 and 102 Stakeholder Visioning Process
Meeting 4
October 25, 2012 6:00-9:00 pm
Wickford Middle School North Kingstown, RI

Draft Meeting Summary

Next Meeting: The next meeting is scheduled for November 7 from 6:00-9:00pm at the Senior Center.

Meeting Participants: See Appendix A.

Next Steps:

- Stakeholder Group Members – Brainstorm creative options that the full group might get behind.
- Ona Ferguson – Write up possible areas of agreement prior to the final meeting.

Welcome and Introductions

Ona Ferguson welcomed participants to the meeting. All meeting materials can be found on the North Kingstown website, <http://www.northkingstown.org/visioning-process-routes-2-and-102>. The meeting summary from Stakeholder Group meeting 3 was approved by the Stakeholder Group. Jon Reiner gave an overview of the October 16th Planning Commission meeting, at which the Commission decided to await the Stakeholder Group report before making a decision on the Rolling Greens application.

Feedback from the Public Engagement Meetings & Online Input

General Process - Ona then described the public engagement effort since the last Stakeholder Group meeting, which included three meetings and a way for people to give input online. Approximately 100 distinct individuals (not including Stakeholder Group members nor Planning Team members) attended one or more of the three meetings, which included two public workshops (October 4 and 15) and one neighborhood focus group (October 10). Most of the people who attended these sessions live near the study area. Approximately 50 individuals contributed their input online, and only a small handful of those (5-10) had also been at any of the three public meetings. Stakeholder Group members received a summary report from the three events and the exported results of the online input in advance of this meeting.

Themes - The themes of what public participants indicated they wanted for the study area included wanting a place with the following characteristics:

- Is safe for people in cars, on foot, and on bicycle, in the neighborhoods and along the major roads
- Adds value to the place, creates a neighborhood feeling, strives for a town rather than city feel
- Does not financially burden the town
- Protects open space and the golf course
- Has additional residential units, especially if a portion of them are age-restricted
- Uses landscaping for beautification and buffering between different types of uses
- Has some enhancements along the Ten Rod Road right of way
- With varied opinions on the capacity and appropriateness of any commercial, some saying there is room for limited, neighborhood-scale commercial, others saying this is not an appropriate place for commercial development beyond what exists now

- For any commercial spaces, buildings with a small footprint and not higher than two stories, and no big box stores
- For residential units, people like single family homes, some also like condos and duplexes, and a small number are also comfortable with apartments
- For uses, people liked the ideas of farmstands, winery, restaurants, small offices or none

Participants discussed the public input briefly, noting that those who gave public input generally loved the open space including significant support for preserving the golf course, and that some talked about preferring that development go on the Schartner parcel not the Bald Hill Garden Center, to protect residential interests of people on Plain Road and current residential neighborhoods.

Input on Specific Scenarios -Nate Kelly, Project Team member from Horsley Witten, presented the five development scenarios discussed since the last Stakeholder Group meeting. These were:

- A. Conservation Design - Presented on Oct 4 & 10.
- B. Mixed-Use Village Scenario (Residential Focus) – Presented on Oct 15
- C. Village Scenario (Commercial Focus) - Presented on Oct 4 & 10
- D. TDR Village Scenario (Commercial Focus) - Presented on Oct 4 & 10
- E. Current Buildout - Presented on Oct 4 & 10

See Appendix B for details on each of these five and the project website for a chart comparing the five scenarios and a graphic representation of each one. Ona gave a quick summary of feedback on each of these scenarios from the public input.

Final Questions on Topics Discussed to Date

Participants had an opportunity to discuss issues they are still unclear about related to overarching themes like economics, water, and the like. They raised the following, with questions in italics and answers from the Planning Team in plain text:

- *Why did the comprehensive plan change “future land uses” in the study area?* One possibility is that technology has gotten more and more precise, enabling us to create exact future land use lines whereas maps used to be hand drawn and therefore less precise. Gradually mapping has used more and more detailed technology, which then enables us to identify inconsistencies.
- *What is the urban services boundary?* A line drawn by the state to indicate areas where growth and infrastructure should be focused. This study area was in the Urban Services Boundary when first created by the state, then North Kingstown asked that it be taken out. The State Planning Office will be fine either way, we just need to be clear what we want to see here.
- *Can a golf course be used as open space in density calculations for number of houses allowed on a cluster development despite the fact that it is a working business?* Yes, it has been done before in North Kingstown.
- *How can we solve Statewide Planning’s concerns?* It depends on what vision this group develops. Depending on the vision for the future that the group reaches, assuming the Town adopts it and streamlines zoning and comprehensive planning to align with it, it should solve Statewide Planning’s concerns. The Schartner parcel was denied as commercial because it was outside of the Urban Services Boundary.

- *Do Exeter and North Kingstown have any control over each others' Urban Service Boundary delineations?* No, they are independent.
- *How are big box stores defined?* A big box in North Kingstown is defined as a space over 50K square feet in a commercial area and over 85K square feet in a planned business zone. Pharmacies are about 15K, so are not considered big box stores.
- *Can we get more clarity on the economic impact of future development in the study area, especially as related to Post Road?* We can't get specific answers comparing those areas and looking at their impact on one another during this visioning effort. But considering the question of how they impact each other and what a researcher might look at, Nate Kelly did a bit more thinking about this and believes that the ~25,000 people who travel through the study area daily are likely a very different group of people than the ~20,000 people who travel through Post Road frequently. The infrastructure, zoning and size of the different areas, and the routes people probably take, make it likely that there isn't much overlap or impact of what happens at the study area and what happens on Post Road, though there is potentially more competition or impact between this area and Lafayette. A stakeholder group mentioned that Post Road has its own problems that can't be addressed during this visioning process.

Discussion of Different Future Visions for the Study Area

Stakeholder group members discussed what they would like to see in the future, using the five scenarios as one frame of reference and looking at various combinations of options for different sites at once. Participants were reminded that the goal is to take others' interests into account enough to develop an option that will work for a broad and diverse set of representatives, and that the details of where the USB or Water Services District can go can be modified once there is a joint vision. Jon Reiner said that water issues can be dealt with in any of the options under discussion. Ona reviewed some notes from the first and second Stakeholder Group meeting in which participants talked about their hopes for the process and outcome and their key interests, and encouraged participants to keep those interests in mind in trying to develop package outcomes that might be feasible.

A member noted that it is difficult to know the geographic scope we are discussing (very local, town-wide, or broader) in different parts of the discussion. Ona noted that the Town Council selected participants specifically to represent all these different voices on the Stakeholder Group. Participants then started tackling the question at hand of what options for a single vision might be workable. They suggested and discussed the following, within a wide-reaching discussion:

- Many people indicated their feelings about Scenarios A-E, with many people indicating that A, D and E were not viable and B and C were of most interest. Some felt A ought to be in the running, and others said a compromise between A and B or between B and C might be workable.
- Some indicated that they don't think the area should be seen as a growth center given all the public input in October.
- Vaughn Oatley and Mark Hawkins talked about the current Rolling Greens as their proposal for what would be appropriate, to meet many interests they've heard over the past few years. They also noted the difficulty of suggesting what should be on other peoples' parcels.
- Some said the Compact Village Development does not meet Exeter's conservation interests.
- The Rolling Greens proposal currently suggests 50K square feet of commercial, but might be possible with less. Some suggested this would be more acceptable if the level of commercial development were set to a maximum of 30K or 40K square feet. Others suggested that it might

be better with more of a setback or reorientation of commercial development, e.g. oriented on a north-south axis in the parcel rather oriented east-west along the road. Someone replied that such an orientation might make the parcels less desirable for businesses.

- People noted that intra-district TDR, which has been discussed as an option, could be very problematic and undermine the purpose of TDRs (Someone asked where the limit is and who can or can't use sending and receiving credits).
- Several people noted that the South County Commons model is not desirable here.
- People talked about the design of different scenarios and noted that how the buildings are spread across given parcels will result in a very different feeling/character.
- People said the design quality of commercial spaces and what you see from the road is important to many around the table.
- Someone said that having commercial uses on all three areas under discussion was undesirable.
- Rit Schartner described his idea of creating a food hub for Rhode Island on his parcels that would include dairy production and processing, teaching centers, and farm to table activities of all kind.
- Many people said they do not like the large commercial buildings that are currently allowed in the study area.
- People suggested buying the difference between the development rights that land owners may not want to part with to get the level of commercial in the area to a level that neighbors can be comfortable with.
- Upon a request from some of the stakeholders, someone attending the meeting spoke for the Bald Hill Garden Center owners, saying that they want their parcel to be allowed to be developed as it was when they purchased it.

There was some straw poll testing of different combinations of scenarios done with the stakeholder group, but none got a high level of approval or support. The amount of commercial on different parcels remains one of the key unresolved items of discussion.

Stakeholder Group Business

The November 7 Stakeholder Group meeting will be this group's fifth and final meeting because the Town Council will be considering the group's input a week later on November 15. Participants said having a meeting prior to November 7 was not feasible for them given election activities.

Ona urged the stakeholders to contact each other prior to the next meeting and explore possible solutions together. She reminded Stakeholder Group members that they are permitted to talk together outside of formal as long as those participating together were a minority of the group as a whole. She offered to be a conduit for communication if one member wanted to email the rest of the participants.

APPENDIX A: Meeting Participants

Stakeholder Group Members & Alternates Present

Alternates are noted with an asterisk()*

Michael Baker
Ahren Cohen
Frank Digregorio
Paul Dion
Mark Hawkins
Meg Kerr
Thomas Kolling*
Al Lyons*
Kevin Maloney
John Nosatch
Vaughn Oatley
Colin O’Sullivan
John Patterson
Jon Reiner
Rit Schartner
Rich Schartner II*
David Schweid
Jeff Zucchi

Members absent

John Nosatch
Martha Pughe

Project Team & NK Planning Dept. Staff

Ona Ferguson
Peter Flinker
Becky Lamond
Nicole LaFontaine
Jared Weaver

Also in Attendance (this list is incomplete)

Jim Ganung
Ann Ganung
Ron Gillette
Ron Mann
Alice O’Sullivan
Jack Revens
David Samson
Marie Samson
Rick Thompson
Skip Ponte

Appendix B: The Five Primary Scenarios Discussed

The following is a quick summary of the scenarios discussed in the public engagement phase of this visioning project. Please see the project website for the five maps depicting what each might look like, a memo with a more detailed description of the scenarios, and to see the chart comparing the scenarios.

- A. Conservation Design Scenario – This scenario for the future development of the intersection is based on existing regulations for Rolling Greens, and changing the zoning on the other three parcels, Schartner Bald Hill Nursery, Corner Tavern, and Bald Hill Garden Center, to residential. The Rolling Greens property could be built under this zoning today. The Morris Farm property (in Exeter) could be built to this development option today. As for the Corner Tavern and the Bald Hill Garden Center, this is what the current Comprehensive Plan states should be built on these properties in the future. These two properties are both currently zoned commercial. This scenario has approximately 54 house lots on the Rolling Greens property, 17 house lots on the Morris Farm (in Exeter), 5 house lots on the Schartner property, the Corner Tavern still has the restaurant on it, and the garden center has 5 house lots.
- B. Mixed-Use Village Scenario (Residential Focus) – This scenario shows the current proposal for Rolling Greens except for a reduction in commercial area from 50,000 square feet to 30,000 s.f. Each of the two Schartner properties, as well as the Bald Hill Garden Center site, would have 20,000 square feet of commercial and 15 residential units. For each of the three properties, these are shown as a mix of five two-bedroom homes, and ten one-bedroom cottages. This proposal would require a zone change and comprehensive plan amendment changing the Rolling Greens property as well as the Schartner parcels, Corner Tavern and the Bald Hill Garden Center to a Compact Village District (CVD). The Corner Tavern current restaurant use would remain unchanged in this scenario.
- C. Village Scenario (Commercial Focus) – This scenario for the future development of the intersection shows the Rolling Greens property as what the applicant would like to build on this piece of property and conceptually expands that development pattern to other commercially zoned pieces of land to the south and west including the Schartner land, the Corner Tavern, and the Bald Hill Garden Center. This proposal would require a zone change and comprehensive plan amendment for all of the focus parcels at the intersection including the entire Rolling Greens property, the Corner Tavern, the Bald Hill Garden Center, and the Schartner Bald Hill Nursery piece to a Compact Village District (CVD). This plan for RG has approximately 50,000 square feet of commercial space, including approximately 5,000 for a new Oatley’s restaurant, and approximately 106 residential housing units. This scenario has 60,000 square feet of office or retail uses at each of the Schartner properties, maintains 6,000 square feet of restaurant at the corner tavern, and adds 67,500 square feet of retail/office at the Bald Hill Garden Center site. The CVD zone allows a commercial building footprint to reach a footprint of 15,000 square feet for a parcel 10 acres in size or larger. If a parcel is less than 10 acres, the largest commercial footprint allowed would be 10,000 square feet. Under this scenario, the maximum number of buildings with a 15,000 square foot footprint would be 3, 1 on the Rolling Greens property, 1 on the Schartner property, and possibly 1 on the Bald Hill Garden Center if they combined some of the land from the Tavern piece to their property to make it 10 acres in size.

- D. Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Village Scenario (Commercial Focus) –This scenario for the future development of the intersection shows an example of a more dense “village development” option for the intersection. Using TDR, the 120,000 square feet of commercial/office space that could be built on the two Schartner properties would be transferred across the street, with 50,000 s.f. added to the Rolling Greens commercial area, 2,500 s.f added to the Corner Tavern property, and 67,500 s.f. added to the potential commercial development on the Bald Hill Garden Center site. This development option would thus have the same total amount of commercial development as the first village scenario, but the development would be more dense (2 or 2-1/2 story buildings instead of single story). Meanwhile both the Morris Farm and the Schartner properties would be permanently protected.

- E. Current Buildout Scenario - This scenario for the future development of the intersection shows what could be built today under the current zoning. These options could realistically meet all of North Kingstown’s groundwater protection requirements, and have sufficient water capacity to build at this development intensity. The specific development types and building sizes are indicated on the plan. This development scenario will include the loss of the golf course, the development of over 50 3-4 bedroom houses in North Kingstown at Rolling Greens, the development of over 120,000 square feet of office or retail on the Schartner property, approximately 75,000 square feet of retail on the garden center property, and either keeping a restaurant, or having a possible pharmacy or other large similar use on the corner tavern property.



**North Kingstown Route 2 and 102 Stakeholder Visioning Process
Regular Meeting Notice**

**Stakeholder Group Meeting 5 Agenda
Wednesday November 7, 2012
6:00 P.M.**

Beechwood Senior Center
44 Beach Street

**North Kingstown Town Hall
80 Boston Neck Road
North Kingstown, RI 02852
401-294-3331**

AGENDA

Stakeholder Group

Members

Michael Baker
Ahren Cohen
Mark Hawkins
Meg Kerr
Kevin Maloney
John Nosatch
Vaughn Oatley
Colin O'Sullivan
John Patterson
Richard Schartner, Sr.
Jeff Zucchi

Non-voting Members

Frank DiGregorio
Paul Dion
Martha Pugh
Jonathan Reiner
David Schweid

Alternates

Michael Abbott
Tom Kolling
Albert Lyons
Richard Schartner II

- 6:00 Welcome and Introductions**
- Review agenda, introductions, approve Meeting 4 notes – Ona Ferguson, CBI
- 6:10 Overview of stakeholder group survey**
- 6:30 Questions from Stakeholder Group on topics discussed to date**
- 6:45 Review of recommendation matrix**
- 7:00 Discussion and development of Preferred Development Option(s)**
- **Development Scenarios plus other options**
 - **Roadway Right of Way Improvements**
 - **Comprehensive Plan Recommendations**
 - **Land Use Designations**
 - **Urban Services Boundary and Growth Centers**
 - **Water Service Area**
- 8:30 Refinement of final recommendations**
- 9:15 Public Comment**
- 9:20 Wrap Up / Stakeholder Group Business**
- Clarify next steps
- 9:30 Adjourn**

Documentation (if any) for items listed on this Agenda is available for public inspection, a minimum of 24 hours prior to the Board meeting, at any time during regular business hours at the Department of Planning, 55 Brown Street, North Kingstown, RI 02852. The Town of North Kingstown will provide interpreters for the hearing impaired given three days notice in advance. 294-3331, Ext 120. Pursuant to RIGL 42-46-6(c) notice of this meeting has been posted on the Secretary of State's website.



Route 2 and 102 Stakeholder Visioning Process Site Visit Meeting Notice

Site Visit 1
Tuesday September 4, 2012
6:00 P.M.

Parking Lot of Oatley's
Ten Rod Road

North Kingstown Town Hall
80 Boston Neck Road
North Kingstown, RI 02852
401-294-3331

AGENDA

6:00 Welcome and walk site

- Areas to be reviewed will be Oatley's, Rolling Greens Golf Course and club house, Schartner Bald Hill Nursery, the Corner Tavern, and the Bald Hill garden Center

Stakeholder Group

Members

Michael Baker
Ahren Cohen
Mark Hawkins
Meg Kerr
Kevin Maloney
John Nosatch
Vaughn Oatley
Colin O'Sullivan
John Patterson
Richard Schartner, Sr.
Jeff Zucchi

Non-voting members

Frank DiGregorio
Paul Dion
Martha Pughe
Jonathan Reiner
David Schweid

Documentation (if any) for items listed on this Agenda is available for public inspection, a minimum of 24 hours prior to the Board meeting, at any time during regular business hours at the Department of Planning, 55 Brown Street, North Kingstown, RI 02852. The Town of North Kingstown will provide interpreters for the hearing impaired given three days notice in advance. 294-3331, Ext 120. Pursuant to RIGL 42-46-6(c) notice of this meeting has been posted on the Secretary of State's website.



Route 2 and 102 Stakeholder Visioning Process Site Visit Meeting Notice

Site Visit 2
Thursday September 6, 2012
7:00 A.M.

Parking Lot of Oatley's
Ten Rod Road

North Kingstown Town Hall
80 Boston Neck Road
North Kingstown, RI 02852
401-294-3331

AGENDA

7:00 A.M. Welcome and walk site

- Areas to be reviewed will be Oatley's, Rolling Greens Golf Course and club house, Schartner Bald Hill Nursery, the Corner Tavern, and the Bald Hill garden Center

Stakeholder Group

Members

Michael Baker
Ahren Cohen
Mark Hawkins
Meg Kerr
Kevin Maloney
John Nosatch
Vaughn Oatley
Colin O'Sullivan
John Patterson
Richard Schartner, Sr.
Jeff Zucchi

Non-voting members

Frank DiGregorio
Paul Dion
Martha Pughe
Jonathan Reiner
David Schweid

Documentation (if any) for items listed on this Agenda is available for public inspection, a minimum of 24 hours prior to the Board meeting, at any time during regular business hours at the Department of Planning, 55 Brown Street, North Kingstown, RI 02852. The Town of North Kingstown will provide interpreters for the hearing impaired given three days notice in advance. 294-3331, Ext 120. Pursuant to RIGL 42-46-6(c) notice of this meeting has been posted on the Secretary of State's website.



**Route 2 and 102 Stakeholder Visioning Process
Site Visit Meeting Notice**

**Site Visit 2
Thursday September 6, 2012
4:00 P.M.**

Parking Lot of Oatley's
Ten Rod Road

**North Kingstown Town Hall
80 Boston Neck Road
North Kingstown, RI 02852
401-294-3331**

AGENDA

Stakeholder Group

Members

Michael Baker
Ahren Cohen
Mark Hawkins
Meg Kerr
Kevin Maloney
John Nosatch
Vaughn Oatley
Colin O'Sullivan
John Patterson
Richard Schartner, Sr.
Jeff Zucchi

Non-voting members

Frank DiGregorio
Paul Dion
Martha Pughe
Jonathan Reiner
David Schweid

4:00 P.M. Welcome and walk site

- Areas to be reviewed will be Oatley's, Rolling Greens Golf Course and club house, Schartner Bald Hill Nursery, the Corner Tavern, and the Bald Hill Garden Center

Documentation (if any) for items listed on this Agenda is available for public inspection, a minimum of 24 hours prior to the Board meeting, at any time during regular business hours at the Department of Planning, 55 Brown Street, North Kingstown, RI 02852. The Town of North Kingstown will provide interpreters for the hearing impaired given three days notice in advance. 294-3331, Ext 120. Pursuant to RIGL 42-46-6(c) notice of this meeting has been posted on the Secretary of State's website.